SUBJECTS.

The Member also suggested that the owners of paddy fields should be directed to protect and keep in proper repair the irrigation channels and canals running along their lands and the banks of such channels and canals, and, in the event of default, the Provertikars should have power to recover from the defaulters the losses caused to the adjoining land-owners by the inattention, and pay the same to such land-owners.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

10. ***Reservation of certain Puduval and Poramboke lands in some localities near agricultural centres for the benefit of the Pulayas and kindred depressed classes.***

Mr. P. K. Govinda Pillai (Member, Nominated) said that the total population of Pulayas in the State numbered about 5 lacs, and of these about one-third were in South Travancore and two-thirds in North Travancore. These classes were labouring under special disabilities, and one of the difficulties was in the matter of finding lands for their habitations. While other Members were advocating the necessity for affording facilities for improving the lands they owned, he prayed, on behalf of the large number of Pulayas whom he represented, for some lands being registered in the names of the Pulayas, on which they might put up huts and which they might cultivate for their benefit. It would be conceded that, without the help of the Pulayas, the wealthy land-owners could not cultivate their lands. Most of the waste lands in the State had already been registered. But there still remained some unregistered lands fit for cultivation in North Travancore. In the Nedumangad, Pathanapuram and Kottarakara taluks, some *Puduval* lands were available for registry and similar areas could be found in other taluks also. Those lands should be registered in the names of the Pulayas who might apply for them. At present, no consideration whatever was paid by the Revenue authorities to the applications of the Pulayas, and there were several cases in which the lands applied for by them were assigned to other more influential persons subsequent to their application. In addition to their applications being disregarded, the Pulaya applicants were also subjected to much ill-treatment in some cases for having made the applications. Having regard to their depressed condition, and consistently with the policy of the Government to lift them up as much as possible, the Member prayed that the applications of the Pulayas for lands migh tbe given preferential consideration.

There were also several bunds adjoining paddy fields and other *Poramboke* bunds. If these were registered in the names of the adjacent land-owners, it would have been a right course, but it was not so done. The Member

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

requested that such bunds might be registered in the names of the Pulayas, who cultivated the neighbouring lands for their owners. He added that he had consulted several ryots and the land owners had no objection whatever to their Pulayas getting such lands registered. The real trouble came from the petty Revenue subordinates.

The Member requested that the matter might be viewed sympathetically and necessary action taken as early as possible.

Dewan's reply.—The Member is requested to send up to Government a list of the *Puduval* lands which, he thinks, may be assigned to the Pulayas.

11. Institution of civil suits, in respect of Kandukrishi lands, by the holders.

Mr. Kanakku Aiyappan Narayanan (Member, Neyyattinkara Taluk) said that, since 916 M. E., it had been the practice for the Government to grant lands to the people on the *kandukrishi* tenure in the same way as lands under the *pandaravagai pattom*, *otti*, *kudi-jenmom* and such other tenures. Such lands were being freely enjoyed and alienated by the people, like other lands, without any interference from the Government. In 1012 M. E., the Government passed orders treating the *Kandukrishi* lands just like other Sirkar lands in respect of *nadavukur* and the Settlement records of 1014 also showed that *nadavukur* was granted by the Government in respect of the *Kandukrishi* lands. The Settlement Memorandum of the late Dewan Mr. Ramiengar laid down that permission should be granted to the owners of the *Kandukrishi* lands to sell, mortgage or otherwise dispose of the same, and that the Sovereign, as the *Jenmi* of such lands, would not incur any loss thereby. It further showed that such alienation was a right vested in the holders of such lands. The Royal Proclamation of 1061, which was based on the Memorandum above referred to, prescribed in Section 28 that the *Kandukrishi* lands should be assessed on the same principles as other lands and that the holders thereof should be permitted to enjoy them so long as they continued to pay the *pattom* to the Government. The Member said that there was thus no obstacle to the possession, enjoyment and alienation of such lands. Nor was there any sort of restriction on the right of the holders of the *Kandukrishi* lands to institute civil suits till 1070 M. E. In that year, Regulation II of 1070 was passed, imposing the restriction that no Civil Court should take cognisance of any suit relating to a *Kandukrishi* land unless the plaint was accompanied by an order of the Government permitting the plaintiff to seek redress in the Civil Court. Even after the passing of this Regulation, the policy of the Governme

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly